

REMARKS

CLAIMS:

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-41 and 44-46 currently comprise the case, Claims 4 and 6 being canceled hereby. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended hereby.

Applicants respectfully submit that the case, upon entry of the present amendment to Claims 1 and 5, is in condition for allowance.

Allowed Claims:

Claims 2, 3, 7-41 and 44-46 are allowed.

Amendments to Claims:

Claim 1 has been amended hereby to respond to the Examiner's remarks that Claim 1 "does not set forth a shock absorbing limitation, only that a shock mount is provided."

The amendment to Claim 1 comprises "a compressible shock mount providing a shock absorbing capability supporting and mounting said data storage device within said cartridge shell, said compressible shock mount configured to fully separate and isolate said data storage device from mechanical contact with said cartridge shell."

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added and that the amendment is supported by the specification, for example, page 16, lines 10-16; page 17, lines 6-11; page 17, lines 20-23.

Claim 5 has been amended to incorporate canceled Claim 4 to provide proper antecedent basis, and to better relate the "flex cable" as defined in the specification.

The amendments to Claim 5 comprise: "The data storage cartridge of Claim 1, for use with a transfer station, said data storage cartridge additionally comprising:

"an external data transfer interface coupled to said data storage device for providing data transfer with respect to said transfer station; and

"a flexible flex cable interconnecting said data storage device and said external data transfer interface, said flexible flex cable configured to a length to provide slack between said data storage device and said external data transfer interface under compression of said compressible shock mount."

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added and that the amendment is supported by the specification, for example, page 17, lines 6-11; page 17, line 17 - page 18, line 4.

The Examiner states "the specification does not clearly define what constitutes a flex cable". Applicants respectfully point to the specification at, inter alia, page 17, lines 6-11; page 17, line 17 - page 18, line 4; and FIGS. 6 and 9.

35 U.S.C. 102:

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Leonhardt et al. (USPN 5,253,246).

Claim 4 has been canceled, and the provisions thereof added to Claim 5, as discussed above. The cancellation of Claim 4 renders the rejection thereof moot.

Claim 1:

With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner states that Leonhardt et al. teaches a data storage cartridge of a form factor of a cartridge having a leader block, and a blocking portion. The Examiner further states the "claimed shock supporting structure is deemed satisfied by the flexible fingers or bands".

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner states that the claim "does not set forth a shock absorbing limitation, only that a shock mount is provided. *** Flexible fingers or bands by their inherent characteristics provide a limited amount of movement which would compensate to some extent, depending upon the severity of a shock, movement of the drive elements due to shock."

Applicants respectfully point out that, Leonhardt et al. recites that the flexible fingers, bands or retention pads 118 are instead characterized as "pressure fit retention elements *** to secure" the media types or miniaturized drive elements. (emphasis added). (column 4, lines 24-28). As further pointed out by the previously submitted Declaration under Rule 1.132, "No shock absorbing capability is provided or suggested" by Leonhardt et al. "Rather, the 'media types or miniaturized drive elements' are always retained and supported in a secure and fixed manner."

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 patentably defines over Leonhardt et al., reciting:

"a data storage device;

"a cartridge shell ***; and

"a compressible shock mount providing a shock absorbing capability supporting and mounting said data storage device within said cartridge shell, said compressible shock mount configured to fully separate and isolate said data storage device

from mechanical contact with said cartridge shell." (Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that Leonhardt et al. provides no shock absorbing capability and is not configured to separate and isolate a data storage device from mechanical contact. Applicants therefore respectfully request allowance of Claim 1 over Leonhardt under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claim 5:

With respect to Claim 5, the Examiner states the "use of a flex cable interface is deemed satisfied by the moveable interface" of Leonhardt et al.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner states "Claim 5 was not written as a means plus function recitation which would then have its meaning and its equivalents provided by the specification. As broadly set forth the limitation of claim 5 are satisfied by the art as applied."

Applicants respectfully submit that, rather, the discussion of Leonhardt relates to a "connector 801 which is affixed to the interior of the housing" (column 5, lines 49-52) or is "movable for partial/full extraction" (column 5, lines 68-69). There is no discussion of a flex cable, and it is likely that sliding contacts are employed, to insure that the connector remains "affixed to the interior of the housing".

Instead, Claim 5 recites "The data storage cartridge of Claim 1, for use with a transfer station, said data storage cartridge additionally comprising:

"an external data transfer interface ***; and

"a flexible flex cable interconnecting said data storage device and said external data transfer interface, said flexible

flex cable configured to a length to provide slack between said data storage device and said external data transfer interface under compression of said compressible shock mount." (Emphasis added).

Leonhardt et al., as discussed above, provides no shock mount, and therefore no isolation, and Applicants submit provides no flexible flex cable having slack.

Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is patentable over Leonhardt under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and respectfully request allowance thereof.

35 U.S.C. 103:

Claim 6 has been canceled, and the cancellation of Claim 6 renders the rejection thereof moot.

Appl. No.: 09/842,030
Amdt. Dated: August 25, 2004
Reply to Office action of 07/08/04

SUMMARY:

Applicants respectfully request entry of the present amendment.

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 5 without the submission of new matter, and have canceled Claims 4 and 6.

Claims 2, 3, 7-41 and 44-46 stand allowed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention, including Claims 1 and 5, distinguishes over the cited patents and respectfully requests that the Examiner allow Applicants' Claims 1-3, 5, 7-41 and 44-46 under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Respectfully submitted,
T. R. Albrecht et al.

By: 

John H. Holcombe, (#20,620)
Attorney for Applicants

From: IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
8987 E. Tanque Verde Rd. #309-374
Tucson, AZ 85749-9610
Telephone: (520) 760-6629

JHH/cw